

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 and 20-24 remain pending

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 14-18 and 21-24

On page 2 of the Final Office Action of March 17, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 14-18 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,789,060 to Wolfe et al. ("Wolfe") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,938,065 to Jain. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for processing voicemail messages. The method includes, among other things, receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, the at least one selection action identifying a portion of one or more voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Wolfe does not specifically disclose or suggest the selection action identifying a portion of the voicemail message transcript for delivery. The Examiner alleged that Jain, at col. 3, lines 36-49 discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Jain discloses that email programs may permit an original recipient of an email message to forward the message to other parties (Jain, at col. 1, lines 31-32). The forwarded message may include the original message from the original sender as well as a message from the original recipient (Jain, at col. 1, lines 32-34). As a message is passed to a number of recipients, the email message may grow in size as each recipient adds to the message (Jain, at col. 1, lines 35-38).

Jain discloses a solution to the above problem in which at least a portion of an email message may be selected as excluded content (Jain, at col. 1, lines 49-51). The email message may be transmitted to a recipient configured to exclude the excluded content from a

message that originates from the recipient, such as a forwarded message or a reply to a message (see Jain, at col. 1, lines 52-54).

Jain, at col. 3, lines 36-39, which the Examiner relied upon for support of the rejection, discloses:

FIG. 2 illustrates an exemplary process flow consistent with the invention. In general, the sender of an email message, e.g. from sender PC 102, may elect 202 whether he or she wants to allow the receiver, e.g. receiver PC 104, to include the text of the email, or portions thereof, in replies to the sender or forwarding of the message to a forward receiver, e.g. forward receiver PC 106. The sender's email application inserts a control header 204 into the email message to control propagation of the text in accordance with the sender's selection. The message is sent to a receiver that controls propagation of the original text based on the control header 206. The sender thus has control over propagation of the original message, and can limit propagation to only selected recipients.

Thus, Jain discloses that the sender of an email message may elect whether to allow the receiver to include portions of the text of the email in replies to the sender or in messages forwarded to other recipients. The sender's email program controls propagation of the email text by inserting a control header into the email message. Thus, the sender has control over which portions of the original message may be propagated by recipients of the sender's email.

Claim 1 requires receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies a portion of one or more of the voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users. In other words, according to the claimed invention of claim 1, the selection action from the one or more users identifies a portion of at least one voicemail message transcript to deliver to one or more identified parties, while Jain discloses that a sender may elect which portions of an email message may be propagated by a recipient of the sender's message. Applicants submit that the selection action of the claimed invention in which an identified portion of the email message is delivered to one or more identified parties is not equivalent to the

disclosure of Jain, in which a sender may elect to prevent propagation of an identified portion of the email message by recipients of the sender's message.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that Wolfe and Jain do not disclose, either separately or in combination, all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Claims 3 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Wolfe and Jain for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 and 6 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 8, 16 and 21 recite features similar to those of claim 1 and are patentable over Wolfe and Jain for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 8, 16 and 21, as well as claims 9-11, which depend from claim 8, claims 17 and 18, which depend from claim 16 either directly or as a base claim, and claims 22-24, which depend from claim 21 either directly or as a base claim, be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 5 and 20

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Jain and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,041 to Reynar et al. ("Reynar") and U.S. Patent No. 6,775,360 to Davidson et al. ("Davidson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1, which is patentable over Wolfe in view of Jain for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Similarly, claim 20 depends from claim 16, which is patentable over Wolfe in view of Jain for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16. Applicants submit that Reynar and Davidson fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Wolfe and Jain. In particular Reynar and Davidson, either separately or on combination with Wolfe and Jain, also fail to disclose or suggest receiving at least one

selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies a portion of one or more of the voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1 and as similarly required by claim 16.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2, 5 and 20 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 4, 7, 12 and 13

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 7, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view Jain and further in view of Davidson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from claim 1, either directly or as a base claim, and are patentable over Wolfe and Jain for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 8, either directly or as a base claim, and are patentable over Wolfe and Jain for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 8. Applicants submit that Davidson fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Wolfe and Jain. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4, 7, 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 12, 2006

By: Richard C. Irving

Correspondence Address:
Samuel H. Dworetsky
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433